



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,211	07/14/2004	Francisco Jose Rico Novella	600.004	3474
58152	7590	10/02/2009		
DEFILLO & ASSOCIATES, INC. P.O. Box 14104 Clearwater, FL 33766				
EXAMINER				
VU, PHU ANH TRAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,211

Applicant(s)

RICO NOVELLA ET AL.

Examiner

PHY ANH VU

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The instant application having Application No. 10/501,211 filed on 7/14/2004 is presented for examination by the examiner.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Specification

A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 30 recites "devices" on line 2, this should be changed to "device". Line 4 recites "an symmetric", this should be changed to "a symmetric". Line 12 recites "cryptographic operations", this should be changed to "cryptographic operation".

Claim 32 recites "verifier devices" on line 2, this should be changed to "verifier device". Line 6 recites "of air", this should be changed to "of an". Line 12 recites "cryptographic operations", this should be changed to "cryptographic operation".

Claim 33 recites "verifier devices" on line 2, this should be changed to "verifier device". Line 5 recites "cryptographic operation", this should be changed to "cryptographic operations". Line 13 recites "cryptographic operations", this should be changed to "cryptographic operation".

Claim 34 recites "cryptographic operations" on line 13, this should be changed to "cryptographic operation"

Claim 35 recites "the document is check", the proper phrase should be "the document is checked".

Claim 36 recites "to be validated in is" on lines 2-3, it appears that there's an extra "in". The sentence should read "to be validated is ready".

Claim 37 recites "operation will he carried out", it appears that the word "be" was incorrectly spelled. The correction sentence should be "operation will be carried out".

Claim 44 recites "an expiry date" on line 2. The proper form for this should be "an expiration date".

Claim 47 recites "code is send", the correct phrase should be "code is sent".

Claim 48 recites "code is send" on line 2, the correct phrase should be "code is sent".

Claim 51 recites "an alphanumerical code", the correct phrase should be "an alphanumeric code".

Claim 53 recites "an alphanumerical code" on line 3, the correct phrase should be "an alphanumeric code".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "the document authentication code" on line 8-9. Line 16, recites "the response". Line 17 recites "the corresponding code". Lines 18-19 recite "the key". Lines 18-19 recite "the key of the group of readers/verifiers/recorders". Line 24, recites "the point". Line 27, recites "the validation". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Line 11 of claim 1 recites "the document". In the preamble, "documents" were introduced in plural form, so it is not clear as to which one of the documents is being addressed here.

Line 16 of claim 1 recites "decrypts a reader operator", it is no clear as to what applicant is intended here, because up to this point, the only thing being encrypted is the document, so this decrypting step should be decrypt the document, not a reader operator.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "the sender" on line 2. Line 5 recites "the data", and "the key". Line 7 recites "the first". Line 21 recites "the first validation". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Line 15 of claim 29 recites "the reader", it is not clear if this reader is different from the readers/verifiers/recorders recited earlier.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "the individualization phase" on line 2. Lines 14-15 recite "the subsequent decryption". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the secret keys". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 32 recites the limitation "the secret key" on lines 15-16. It is not clear as to which one of the "secret keys" is being addressed here, since the aforementioned "secret keys" are in plural form.

Claim 33 recites the limitation "the appropriate individualization key" on line 10-11. Lines 15-16 recite "the verification of the signature". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Line 18 of claim 33 recites "the public key", it is not clear as to which one of the "public keys" is being addressed here, since the aforementioned "public keys" are in plural form.

Claim 34 recites "the public keys" on line 3. Line 7 recites "the secret key". Lines 10-11 recite "the appropriate individualization key".

Claim 36 recites "the list of validated" on line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 37 recites "the corresponding cryptographic operation" on lines 3-4. Line 6 recites "the result". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 38 recites "the cryptographic authentication" on line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 39 recites "the pertinent messages between the two" on line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 40 recites "the senders" on line 2. Line 3 recites "the encryption of the serial number". Line 5 recites "the master key", "master keys" were introduced in plural form in the previous sentence, so it is not clear as to which of the master key is being addressed here. Line 6 recites "the identifier", and line 7 recites "the user". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 43 recites "the identifiers" on line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 47 recites "the user's mobile telephone". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 48 recites "the user's electronic agenda". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 53 recites "the event the automatic reading code deteriorates" on line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 54 recites "the correct reading order". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 28-29, 31-38, 40-43, 46, 48-50, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al (US 7093130, hereinafter Kobayashi).

Regarding claim 28, Kobayashi discloses a system for sending and validating documents using authentication codes and portable verifier elements which can process and store information and which offer a high level of protection against unauthorized readers and writers, the system comprising:

an authentication code for a particular portable verifier device (*i.e.*: column 16, lines 6-52; column 17, lines 16-27);

a portable verifier device to receive the document authentication code (*i.e.*: column 16, line 53-column 17, lines 15; column 18, lines 4-30);

at least one portable verifier device operator to encrypt the document to be decrypted by the portable verifier device (*i.e.*: column 16, line 66-column 17, lines 15; column 20, lines 60-64);

at least one key loaded into the portable verifier device (*i.e.*: column 17, lines 15-30);

a document portal to select and/or purchase the document (*i.e.*: column 15, line 57-column 16, line 3);

a reader/verifier/recorder to read the document authentication code, transmit it to the portable verifier device, receive the response, decrypts a reader operator using the corresponding code, and validates or rejects the document (*i.e.*: column 16, line 53-column 17, line 15; column 18, lines 15-37);

wherein the reader operator encrypts the document using the key of the group of readers/verifiers/recorders in charge of validating the document (*i.e.*: column 16, line 66-column 17, line 3);

wherein the authentication code is indicated directly or indirectly by a person requesting the document (*i.e.*: *column 16, line 6-37*);

wherein no data record of any type is required in the portable verifier device up to the point at which the document is validated (*i.e.*: *column 13, lines 43-57*; *column 14, lines 1-19*);

wherein the portable verifier device is actively involved in the validation (*i.e.*: *column 18, line 15-37*); and

wherein the portable verifier device contains a stored list of validated documents such that it is possible to determine, at least, whether or not this is a first validation (*i.e.*: *column 13, lines 16-22*; *column 18, lines 45-50*).

Regarding claim 29, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the portable verifier device is individualized by the sender using one or more keys of the portable verifier device;

wherein the document is generated from a document portal and the data considered relevant is coded using the key that corresponds to the group of readers/verifiers/recorders involved in the validation of the document, so that the first cryptographic operation can be carried out (*i.e.*: *column 15, line 57-column 16, line 3*; *column 17, lines 16-22*; *column 20, lines 60-64*).

wherein a second cryptographic operation is linked to the first cryptographic operation and includes the key corresponding to the portable verifier device associated with the document (*i.e.*: *column 16, line 66-column 17, line 3*; *column 18, line 15-37*),

wherein an authentication code is created for the document and is incorporated therein as a result of these cryptographic operations (*i.e.*: column 16, line 6-37; column 16, line 66-column 17, line 15);

wherein the document is checked by the reader and its authentication code and a third cryptographic operation is carried out to verify those already employed to generate the document (*i.e.*: column 18, lines 15-37);

wherein the portable verifier contains a list of validated documents such that it is possible to determine whether or not this is the first validation (*i.e.*: column 13, lines 16-22; column 18, lines 45-50).

Regarding claim 31, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the portable verifier devices is individualized by storing one or more portable verifier device keys, which must be the secret keys of an asymmetric or public key cryptographic algorithm;

wherein the first and second cryptographic operations are based on public key cryptography which is composed of a digital signature with a secret key, and the readers/verifiers/recorders involved in the validation of the document will know its corresponding public key, and an encryption using the corresponding public key of the portable verifier device associated with the document (*i.e.*: column 16, line 66-column 17, line 18);

wherein the third cryptographic operations is based on a public key cryptography composed of a decryption using the secret key corresponding to the portable verifier

device associated with the document and the verification of the signature, using the corresponding public key stored in the readers/verifiers/recorders (*i.e: column 18, lines 15-37*).

Regarding claim 32, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 29 wherein the portable verifier devices is individualized by storing one or more portable verifier device keys, which must be the secret keys of an asymmetric or public key cryptographic algorithm;

wherein the first and second cryptographic operations are based on public key cryptography which is composed of air encryption using the public key of the readers/verifiers/recorders involved in the validation of the document, and an encryption using the corresponding public key of the portable verifier device associated with the document (*i.e: column 16, line 66-column 17, line 18*); and

wherein the third cryptographic operations is based on public key cryptography composed of a decryption using the secret key corresponding to the portable verifier device associated with the document and a decryption using the secret key of the readers/verifiers/recorders (*i.e: column 18, lines 15-37*).

Regarding claim 33, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 29 wherein the portable verifier devices is individualized by storing one or more portable verifier device keys, which are the public, keys of an asymmetric or public key cryptographic algorithm;

wherein the first and second cryptographic operation are based on public key cryptography which includes a digital signature using the secret key that corresponds to the public key stored in the readers/verifiers/recorders involved in the validation of the document and another digital signature using the secret key corresponding to the appropriate individualization key stored in the portable verifier device associated with the document (*i.e: column 16, line 66-column 17, line 18*); and

wherein the third cryptographic operations is based on public key cryptography composed of the verification of the signature by the portable verifier device associated with the document using the appropriate individualization key and a second verification of the signature using the public key of the readers/verifiers/recorder (*i.e: column 18, lines 15-37*) .

Regarding claim 34, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 29 wherein the portable verifier device is individualized by storing one or more portable verifier device keys, which must be the public keys of an asymmetric or public key cryptographic algorithm;

wherein the first and second cryptographic operations are based on public key cryptography which is composed of an encryption using the public key corresponding to the secret key stored in the readers/verifiers/recorders involved in the validation of the document and a digital signature using the secret key corresponding to the appropriate individualization key stored in the portable verifier device associated with the document (*i.e: column 16, line 66-column 17, line 18*);

wherein the third cryptographic operations will be based on public key cryptography composed of the verification of the signature by the portable verifier device associated with the document using the appropriate individualization key and a decryption using the secret key corresponding to the readers/verifiers/recorders (*i.e.*: *column 18, lines 15-37*) .

Regarding claim 35, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 34 wherein the document is check before the document is validated (*i.e.*: *column 18, lines 15-37; column 24, lines 61-67*).

Regarding claim 36, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 35 wherein the reader/verifier/recorder is informed if the document to be validated in is already included in the list of validated documents so that it can proceed as appropriate (*i.e.*: *column 18, lines 38-50*).

Regarding claim 37, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 36 wherein the document to be validated is included in the list of validated documents, provided it was not already there, and the corresponding cryptographic operation will he carried out when reversing, and/or checking the cryptographic operation corresponding to the portable verifier device, and the result is sent to the reader/verifier/recorder so that it can proceed as appropriate (*i.e.*: *column 12, lines 8-14; column 18, lines 15-50*).

Regarding claim 38, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 29 wherein the cryptographic authentication established between the portable verifier device and the reader/verifier/recorder is mutual and firm (*i.e.* column 18, lines 15-50).

Regarding claim 40, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the portable verifier device is individualized by the senders using one or more keys obtained from the encryption of the serial number with one or more master keys chosen by the portable verifier device operators, so that the master key of each operator and the portable verifier device corresponds to the identifier, which should be legible by the user (*i.e.* column 16, lines 6-37, 53-column 17, line 22; column 20, lines 60-64).

Regarding claim 41, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the reader/verifier/recorder has been adapted to send information, accepting or rejecting the document and stating the reason why (*i.e.* column 13, lines 16-22; column 16, lines 66-column 17, line 15; column 18, lines 38-50).

Regarding claim 42, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the reader/verifier/recorder keys are common to the group of readers (*i.e.* column 16, lines 66-column 17, line 3; column 18, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 43, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the keys stored in the readers/verifiers/recorders are obtained by encrypting the identifiers, or parts of these, using the master keys chosen by the operators (*i.e.*: column 16, line 66-column 17, line 3).

Regarding claim 46, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the document and/or authentication code are selected and obtained through internet (*i.e.*: column 16, line 53-column 17, line 3).

Regarding claim 48, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the document's authentication code is send to the user's electronic agenda or any other similar device belonging to the user (*i.e.*: column 22, lines 66-column 23, line 6).

Regarding claim 49, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the authentication code can be printed through a barcode (*i.e.*: column 17, lines 19-22).

Regarding claim 50, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28 wherein the authentication code can be printed through one or more barcodes (*i.e.*: column 17, lines 19-22).

Regarding claim 54, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 49 wherein the barcodes include the correct reading order (*i.e.* column 24, lines 61-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi.

Regarding claim 30, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 29 wherein the individualization phase of the portable verifier devices is carried out by storing one or more portable verifier device keys, which must be an encryption algorithm;

wherein the first and second cryptographic operations are made up of two encryptions using cryptographic algorithm, one using the key of the group of readers/verifiers/recorders involved in the validation of the document and the other using the key that corresponds to the portable verifier device associated with the document (*i.e.* column 16, lines 6-37; line 66-column 17, line 18; column 19, lines 33-43; column 20, lines 60-64);

wherein the third cryptographic operations includes decrypting, by the portable verifier device using its corresponding key of the document's authentication code and

the subsequent decryption, carried out by the aforementioned reader/verifier/recorder and its corresponding code (*i.e.* column 18, lines 15-37).

Kobayashi does not disclose symmetric or secret key encryption algorithm.

However, official notice is taken that symmetric or secret key encryption algorithm is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the symmetric or secret key encryption algorithm into the system of Kobayashi to simplify the process by reducing the amount of keys needed to carry out the cryptographic algorithm.

Regarding claim 52, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28.

Kobayashi does not disclose the authentication code can be printed through a dot code.

However, official notice is taken that an authentication code can be printed through a dot code is well known. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the dot code into the system of Kobayashi to eliminate the need for manual entry of data.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi and further in view of Simpson et al (US 2003/0081788, hereinafter Simpson).

Regarding claim 39, Kobayashi discloses the system according to claim 38.

Kobayashi does not disclose random session key is established between the portable verifier device and the reader/verifier/recorder and is used to encrypt the pertinent messages between the two.

However, Simpson discloses a random session key is established between two devices and is used to encrypt the pertinent messages between the two (*i.e.* [0005]).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the feature disclosed by Simpson into the system of Kobayashi to provide for a faster overall encryption-decryption times than those using a simple public-private key approach (*i.e.* [0005]).

Claims 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi, and further in view of Carpenter et al (US 2003/0229638, hereinafter Carpenter).

Regarding claim 44, Kobayashi discloses the system according to claim 28, wherein the document has a time and place of the event, this will be included in the authentication code (*i.e.* column 24, lines 1-6, 30-41).

Kobayashi does not disclose the document has an expiry date, and that can be eliminated from the list of validated documents stored in the portable verifier once this date has passed.

However, Carpenter discloses deleting a document from the searchable content database in the event the document data has expired (*i.e.* [0048]).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the feature disclosed by Carpenter into the system of Kobayashi in order to increase the expedite search time by eliminating documents that are no longer valid.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi, Carpenter et al (US 2003/0229638, hereinafter Carpenter), and further in view of Creighton et al (US 2002/0032665 hereinafter Creighton).

Regarding claim 45, Kobayashi and Carpenter disclose the system according to claim 44 wherein the portable verifier device receives the date expired document to be deleted from the list of validated documents.

Kobayashi and Carpenter do not disclose a digital certificate sent by a competent body.

However, Creighton discloses a digital certificate is sent by a competent body (*i.e.*: [0038]-[0039][0041]-[0042]).

One of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate to feature disclosed by Creighton into the system of Kobayashi and Carpenter to ensure that the information received is from a trusted party.

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi, and further in view of Engberg et al. (US 6,993,658, hereinafter Engberg).

Regarding claim 47, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28.

Kobayashi does not disclose wherein the document authentication code is send to the user's mobile telephone.

However, Engberg discloses a token is transmitted to a user device such as a mobile phone (*i.e: abstract; column 2, lines 6-8*)

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the feature disclosed by Engberg into the system of Kobayashi to enhance the security of information being protected while conveniently using a device that many users already carry (*i.e: column 1, lines 54-59*).

Claims 51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi, and further in view of Thaxton (US 2003/0035539).

Regarding claim 51, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 28.

Kobayashi does not explicitly disclose wherein the authentication code can be printed through an alphanumerical code.

However, Thaxton discloses an authentication code can be printed through an alphanumerical code (*i.e.* [0033]).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the feature disclosed by Thaxton into the system of Kobayashi to provide protection that eliminate or at least greatly reduce the chances of fraud (*i.e.* [0005])

Regarding claim 53, Kobayashi also discloses the system according to claim 49.

Kobayashi does not explicitly disclose wherein the authentication code can also be printed through an alphanumerical code so that it can be keyed in manually in the event the automatic reading code deteriorates.

However, However, Thaxton discloses an authentication code can be printed through an alphanumerical code (*i.e.* [0033]).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the feature disclosed by Thaxton into the system of Kobayashi to provide protection that eliminate or at least greatly reduce the chances of fraud (*i.e.* [0005])

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHY ANH VU whose telephone number is (571)270-7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thr 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHY ANH VU/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437